REMARKS

The Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration in view of the following remarks and amendments. Claims 1, 6, 16, 19, 26, 29, and 31 are amended. Accordingly, claims 1-6, 8-10, 16-21, 23-26, and 28-31 are pending in the application.

I.   Claims Rejected Under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1-29 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 7,047,497 issued to Patrizio et al. (hereinafter "Patrizio"). To establish an anticipation rejection the Examiner must show that the cited reference teaches each element of a claim.

The Examiner has applied the rejection to claims 1-29. However, on page 3 of the Office Action, only the reasons pertaining to claims 29-31 are included in the section. Because the Examiner rejected many of these claims as being obvious over Patrizio and other cited art, the Applicant believes claims 1-28 were erroneously included in the rejection. For the purpose of responding to the rejection, the Applicant will interpret the rejection as being applied to claims 29-31 instead of claims 1-29. However, if this assumption is incorrect, the Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner include the reasons for establishing a rejection of the claims not included, namely claims 1-6, 8-10, 16-21, 23-26, and 28.

Claim 29, as amended, includes the elements of "the central storage node to send information included in the configuration data structure to a node within a sub-cluster in response to a request from the node." The amendment is supported, for example, by paragraphs [0015] and [0018] of the Specification. Patrizio, on the other hand, fails to teach these elements. In particular, Patrizio displays a listing of packages configured for the cluster as shown in Fig. 3, but is silent on whether any information is sent "to a node within a sub-cluster," as required by the claim. See Patrizio, column 4, lines 13-17. As shown in Fig. 1, Patrizio uses a tree graphical control to display the nodes in the cluster, but again Patrizio is silent on whether any information is sent to the nodes in the cluster, let alone, "in response to a request from the node." Patrizio, in fact, fails to teach anything related to configuration information or managing such information because it is directed to a GUI display that only uses the network software as an example to display. See Patrizio, column 3, lines 24-34. As a result, Patrizio fails to teach the elements of

"the central storage node to send information included in the configuration data structure to a node within a sub-cluster in response to a request from the node," as recited in the claim. Thus, for at least these reasons, <u>Patrizio</u> fails to teach each element of claim 29. Further, claims 30 and 31 are not anticipated by <u>Patrizio</u> because each of these claims depends on claim 29. Accordingly, the Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 29-31.

II.   <u>Claims Rejected Under 35 U.S.C. § 103</u>

Claims 1, 2, and 16-18 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,366,915 issued to Rubert et al. ("<u>Rubert</u>") in view of <u>Patrizio</u>. To establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness: (1) there must be some suggestion or motivation, either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art, to modify the reference; (2) there must be a reasonable expectation of success; and (3) the references when combined must teach or suggest all of the claim limitations. <u>See</u> <u>MPEP</u> § 2142.

Claim 1, as amended, includes the elements of "a user interface to . . . to manage configuration information of at least one dispatcher node that distributes requests to a plurality of nodes of the clustered system." The amendment is supported, for example, by paragraph [0013] and [0017] of the Specification. <u>Rubert</u> fails to teach these elements. The Examiner conceded on page 4 of the Office Action that <u>Rubert</u> fails to teach the elements of "configuration information of a node within a clustered system," as recited in the claim. As a result, <u>Rubert</u> fails to teach or suggest the elements of "a user interface to . . . manage configuration information of at least one dispatcher node that distributes requests to a plurality of nodes of the clustered system," as required by the claim. In addition, <u>Patrizio</u> fails to cure the deficiencies of <u>Rubert</u>. In Fig. 3, <u>Patrizio</u> displays the listing of configured packages of the cluster, but does not indicate "a dispatcher node that distributes requests to a plurality of nodes," in the GUI display. From what is taught in <u>Patrizio</u>, all nodes are hierarchically grouped according to cluster, but <u>Patrizio</u> makes no further distinction between the nodes. <u>See</u> <u>Patrizio</u>, column 3, lines 35-43. Therefore, <u>Patrizio</u> fails to teach or suggest the elements of "a user interface to . . . to manage configuration information of at least one dispatcher node that distributes requests to a plurality of nodes of the clustered system." Consequently, for at least the foregoing reasons, <u>Rubert</u> in view of <u>Patrizio</u>

fails to teach or suggest each element of claim 1. Further, Rubert in view of Patrizio fails to teach or suggest each element of claim 2 because of its dependency on claim 1. Accordingly, the Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1 and 2.

Claim 16, as amended, recites the elements of "sending the configuration information to the node in response to a request from the node." The amendment is supported, for example, by paragraph [0022] of the Specification. The Examiner conceded (see page 7 of the Office Action) that Rubert fails to teach the elements of "configuration information," which is related to "a node contained within a cluster," as recited in the claim. As a result, Rubert fails to teach or suggest the elements of "sending the configuration information to the node in response to a request from the node," as required by the claim as well. In addition, Patrizio fails to cure these deficiencies. Although Patrizio appears to show a property sheet including packages that are configured for a particular cluster, Patrizio fails to teach that the GUI interface responds to requests from the nodes shown in the property sheet. See Patrizio, column 3, lines 35-43. Consequently, Patrizio fails to teach the elements of "sending the configuration information to the node in response to a request from the node," as recited in the claim. Hence, Patrizio fails to teach each element of claim 16. Therefore, for at least the foregoing reasons, Rubert in view of Patrizio fails to teach or suggest each element of claim 16. Further, claims 17 and 18 are also not obvious over Rubert in view of Patrizio because of their dependencies on claim 16. Accordingly, the Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 16-18.

Claims 6, 8-10, 16-19, and 26 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rubert in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,564,261 issued to Gudjonsson et al ("Gudjonsson").

Claim 6, as amended, recites the elements of "determining a conflict between each custom parameter included in the property sheet with the different default parameter of the corresponding property of the replacement component." The amendment is supported, for example, by paragraph [0030] of the Specification. The Examiner on page 9 of the Office Action conceded that Rubert fails to teach the elements of "a different default parameter," and "a corresponding property of a replacement component." As a result, Rubert also fails to teach the elements of "determining a conflict between each custom parameter included in the property sheet with *the different default parameter of the corresponding property of the replacement*

component," (emphasis added) as recited in the claim. Further, Gudjonsson fails to cure these deficiencies. Instead, Gudjonsson discloses that "[a]dministrative tools . . . change certain settings of the system . . . [and] are responsible for notifying all components in a cluster of changes to settings that affect them." See Gudjonsson, column 18, lines 24-28. However, Gudjonsson fails to teach whether any conflicts are determined from the changes to settings. Therefore, Gudjonsson fails to teach or suggest the elements of "determining a conflict between each custom parameter included in the property sheet with the different default parameter of the corresponding property of the replacement component," as required by the claim. Thus, for at least the foregoing reasons, Rubert in view of Gudjonsson fails to teach or suggest each element of claim 6. Further, claims 8-10 are also not obvious over Rubert in view of Gudjonsson because of their dependencies on claim 6. Accordingly, the Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 6 and 8-10.

In regard to claim 16, as discussed previously, Rubert fails to teach the elements of "sending the configuration information to the node in response to a request from the node," as recited in the claim. Further, Gudjonsson fails to cure these deficiencies. As mentioned above, Gudjonsson simply discloses that the administrative tools "change certain settings . . . [and] are responsible for notifying all components in a cluster of changes to settings that affect them." See Gudjonsson, column 18, lines 24-28. Gudjonsson, however, is silent on whether the components *request configuration information from the administrative tools.* As a result, Gudjonsson fails to teach or suggest the elements of "sending the configuration information to the node in response to a request from the node," as required by the claim. In view of the foregoing reasons, Rubert in view of Gudjonsson fails to teach or suggest each element of claim 16. Claims 17 and 18 also are not obvious over Rubert in view of Gudjonsson because of their dependencies on claim 16. According, the Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 16-18.

In regard to claim 19 and 26, the Examiner failed to include the reasons for the rejection of the claims based on Rubert in view of Gudjonsson. The Applicant believes that the Examiner erroneously included claims 19 and 26 in this section because the Examiner reasserted the rejection of the claims in the subsequent section of the Office Action (starting on page 11).

Therefore, the Applicant addresses the Examiner's rejection of claims 19 and 26 in the discussion below.

Claims 19 and 26 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rubert in view of Gudjonsson in further view of U.S. Patent No. 6,983,324 issued to Block et al. (hereinafter "Block").

Claim 19, as amended, recites the elements of "selectively updating the parameters included in the property sheet in response to replacing a component *by comparing each default parameter of the component to be replaced with a corresponding default parameter of a replacement component*." (emphasis added.) The amendment is supported, for example, by paragraph [0032] of the Specification. The Examiner on page 12 of the Office Action admitted that Rubert in view of Gudjonsson fails to teach or suggest the elements of "selectively updating the parameters included in the property sheet in response to replacing a component." As a result, Rubert in view of Gudjonsson also fails to teach or suggest the elements of "comparing a default property name of the component to be replaced with a corresponding default property name of a replacement component," as required by the claim. Further, Block fails to cure these deficiencies. Instead, Block simply teaches a modification operation (invoked by the node) that determines whether each parameter to be modified conforms with a predetermined range of values. See Block, column 7, lines 52-62. The predetermined range of values, on the other hand, represents *all possible values for the parameter*, but does not correspond with the *previous default value* of the parameter. As a result, there is no teaching that Block's modification operation performs a comparison of "each default parameter of the component to be replaced with a corresponding default parameter of a replacement component," as required by the claim. Therefore, Block fails to teach or suggest each element of claim 19. Thus, for at least the foregoing reasons, Rubert in view of Gudjonsson in further view of Block fails to teach or suggest each element of claim 19. Accordingly, the Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claim 19.

In regard to claim 26, this claim recites analogous elements to those recited in claim 19. Therefore, for at least the reasons discussed in connection with claim 19, Rubert in view of Gudjonsson in further view of Block fails to teach or suggest each element of claim 26.

Accordingly, the Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claim 26.

Claims 3-5 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rubert in view of Patrizio in further view of U.S. Patent Publication No. 2005/0114315 issued to Tanner et al. ("Tanner").

Claims 3-5 depend from claim 1 and incorporate the limitations thereof. Therefore, for at least the reasons discussed in connection with claim 1, Rubert in view of Patrizio fails to teach or suggest each element of claims 3-5. Tanner fails to cure these deficiencies. Tanner, instead, teaches a multi-row editing function. See Tanner, paragraphs [0065] and [0066]. However, Tanner fails to teach the elements of "a user interface . . . to manage configuration information of at least one dispatcher node that distributes requests to a plurality of nodes of the clustered system," as recited in claim 1. As a result, Tanner fails to teach or suggest each element of claims 3-5 because of their dependency on claim 1. Thus, in light of at least these reasons, Rubert in view of Patrizio in further view of Tanner fails to teach or suggest each element of claims 3-5. Accordingly, the Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 3-5.

Claims 20-25 and 28 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rubert in view of Gudjonsson in view of Block in further view of Tanner.

Claim 22 was previously canceled in a prior response. Therefore, the Examiner's rejection is moot.

In regard to claims 20, 21, and 23-25, these claims depend from base claim 19 and incorporate the limitations thereof. Therefore, for at least the reasons discussed in connection with claim 19, Rubert in view of Gudjonsson in further view of Block fails to teach or suggest each element of claims 20, 21, and 23-25. In addition, Tanner fails to cure these deficiencies. Tanner, as discussed previously, teaches a multi-row editing function. See Tanner, paragraphs [0065] and [0066]. However, the selection process used to accomplish the multi-row editing function fails to perform a comparison for "each default parameter of the component to be replaced with a corresponding default parameter of a replacement component," as required by the

claim. Instead, "[w]hen a user makes a change to any of the data items, the change is automatically propagated to the same data item in the other rows," and no such comparison is performed. See Tanner, paragraph [0065]. Therefore, Tanner fails to teach or suggest the elements of "selectively updating the parameters included in the property sheet in response to replacing a component by comparing each default parameter of the component to be replaced with a corresponding default parameter of a replacement component," as recited in claim 19. Thus, Tanner fails to teach or suggest each element of claims 20, 21, and 23-25 because of their dependency on claim 19. Consequently, Rubert in view of Gudjonsson in view of Block in further view of Tanner fails to teach or suggest each element of claims 20, 21, and 23-25. Accordingly, the Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of 20, 21, and 23-25.

In regard to claim 28, this claim depends from base claim 26 and incorporates the limitations thereof. Therefore, for at least the reasons discussed in connection with claim 26, Rubert in view of Gudjonsson in further view of Block fails to teach or suggest each element of claim 28. In addition, claim 26 recites analogous elements to those recited in claim 19. Thus, for at least the reasons mentioned in connection with claim 19, Rubert in view of Gudjonsson in view of Block in further view of Tanner fails to teach or suggest each element of claim 28 because of its dependency on claim 26. Accordingly, the Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claim 28.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, it is believed that all claims now pending patentably define the subject invention over the prior art of record, and are in condition for allowance and such action is earnestly solicited at the earliest possible date. If the Examiner believes that a telephone conference would be useful in moving the application forward to allowance, the Examiner is encouraged to contact the undersigned at (310) 207 3800.

Respectfully submitted,

BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN LLP

Dated: August 31, 2007   /Thomas M. Coester/
                                           Thomas M. Coester, Reg. No. 39,637

1279 Oakmead Parkway
Sunnyvale, CA 94085-4040
(310) 207-3800

CERTIFICATE OF ELECTRONIC FILING

I hereby certify that this paper is being transmitted online via EFS Web to the Patent and Trademark Office, Commissioner for Patents, Post Office Box 1450, Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450, on ___ 8-31 ___, 2007.

Melissa Stead   8-31, 2007